

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 11, and 12 have been amended, and claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 11, and 12 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 3, and 11 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 3A and 3B, and in paragraphs [0042] and [0043].

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these Amendments. In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

***Drawing Objection***

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failure to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that "the thin film transistor in the driving circuit portion including an offset region in its gate region" is not shown in the drawings. Because claim 4 has been amended, the drawings show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-4, 6, and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0066147 A1 issued to Park, *et al.* (“Park”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants believe that Park is an improper reference upon which a rejection under § 103(e) may be based. Park was filed in the United States on September 30, 2003, and was published on April 8, 2004. Thus, Park has a § 102(e) date based upon the filing date of the United States application: September 30, 2003. See MPEP 706.02 and 706.02(b). The pending Application properly claims priority to and the benefit of Korean Application No. 2003-0049075, and Korean Application No. 2003-0049076, both filed on July 18, 2003. Because Park was filed after the claimed priority date for this Application, Park is not a proper reference upon which a § 102(e) rejection may be based.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-4, 6, and 11-12 on the basis of Park.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-4, 6, and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP 080-160464 issued to Jinno (“Jinno”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the examiner must present three criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations.

The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent application's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, a flat panel display where "a thin film transistor in the pixel array portion comprises a plurality of channel regions corresponding to multiple gates." Jinno does not teach or suggest these features. Rather, in Figure 1 of Jinno, Jinno teaches a single channel region, with differing regions of resistance, corresponding to a single gate under the gate electrode between the source and the drain. Therefore, Jinno does not teach or suggest "a thin film transistor in the pixel array portion comprises a plurality of channel regions corresponding to multiple gates." Accordingly, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 1 under § 103(a).

Further, because claims 3 and 11 are similarly amended, Jinno does not teach or suggest every element of these claims, and the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 3 and 11 under § 103(a).

Since the none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 3 and 11, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-4, 6, and 11-12.

Because claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice, the rejection of claim 6 is rendered moot.


**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: February 9, 2006

**CUSTOMER NO.: 58027**  
**H.C. Park & Associates, PLC**  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP/WMH/alj